

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended herein. Claims 1-22 remain pending in this patent application. No new matter has been added as a result of the Claim amendments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

The present office action states that Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the methods recited in the claimed invention do not produce a real life, real world, useful, concrete and tangible result. Applicants have amended Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 and as such respectfully submit that Claims 1, 8 and 15 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Regarding Independent Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 8), Claim 1 recites:
A method of managing a testing task, said method comprising:
receiving a plurality of test cases to run, each test case including a plurality of requirements for running said respective test case;
receiving an identification of a group of available test systems on which to run said test cases;
for each test case, determining a list of applicable test systems from said group that satisfy said requirements of said respective test case;
automatically selecting and starting test cases to run based on each respective list and said available test systems so that as many test cases as possible are run in parallel; and
when any test case finishes running and releases a test system to said group of available test systems, automatically selecting and starting an additional test case to run if possible based on said respective list and said available test systems; and providing the results of the testing task (emphasis added).

Support for the Claim amendment is found throughout the Claims and Specification including page 8 lines 1-5 and Figure 2.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that Independent Claim 1 does provide a real life, real world, useful, concrete tangible result. In particular, Independent

Claim 1 provides the real world tangible “results of the testing task”. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is overcome and as such, Claims 1 and 8 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-7 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 9-14 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 8 respectively. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-7 and 9-14 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

With respect to Independent Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 15 recites:

A system comprising:

- a plurality of available test systems;
- a controller for controlling said available test systems; and
- a test driver for receiving a plurality of test cases, each test case including a plurality of requirements for running said respective test case, wherein said test driver matches said available test systems with said test cases based on said requirements, and wherein said test driver selects and starts test cases to run so that as many test cases as possible are run in parallel based on said available test systems and said requirements, [[and]] wherein when any test case finishes, a test system of said finished test case is released to said plurality of available test systems, and any results of the testing cases are output (emphasis added).

Support for the Claim amendment is found throughout the Claims and Specification including page 8 lines 1-5 and Figure 2.

Thus, Claim 15 does indeed provide a tangible real world result. For example, Claim 15 provides the real world tangible “results of the testing task are output”. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is overcome and as such, Claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 16-22 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 15 respectively. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 16-22 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-22 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner Blecher LLP

Date: 5/21/07



John P. Wagner, Jr.

Reg. No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076
(408) 938-9060